



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/589,288 | 06/08/2000 | Guo-Liang Yu | PF342P3C5 | 1519 |
| 73326 7590 02/22/2011 Leydig, Voit & Mayer Ltd. Two Prudential Plaza - Suite 4900 180 North Stetson Avenue Chicago, IL 60601-6731 | | | | |
| EXAMINER BUNNER, BRIDGET E | | | | |
| ART UNIT 1647 | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE 02/22/2011 | | DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chgpatent@leydig.com

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 09/589,288 | Applicant(s) YU ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Bridget E. Bunner | Art Unit 1647 | |

All Participants:
 (1) Bridget E. Bunner.
 (2) Rebecca Dise.
Date of Interview: 11 February 2011

Status of Application: RCE
 (3) John Kilyk, Jr.
 (4) _____.
Time: 4:45 pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
N/A

Claims discussed:
N/A

Prior art documents discussed:
N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Bridget E Bunner/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated that the claim set filed with the request for continued examination on 23 September 2010 did not incorporate the Examiner's amendment of 22 September 2009. The Examiner requested the filing of a new claim set to reflect the Examiner's amendment. Ms. Dise and Mr. Kilyk indicated that they would be able to submit a new claim set.